

**Remarks**

At present Claims 1-2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 based upon the patent to Sethuram et al. (US patent number 5,828,903 issued on October 27, 1998 and having a priority date of September 30, 1994). This patent represents newly cited art which applicants' have not previously been made aware of. Furthermore, it is noted that since this is a non-final rejection all amendments to applicants' claims herein are being made as of right. With respect to the rejection of applicants' Claims 1 and 2 it is noted that this rejection is respectfully traversed. Accordingly, Claims 1-4 remain pending in the present application.

Preliminarily, it is noted that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is a narrow ground of rejection. It requires each and every recited claim element to be found within the four corners of a single cited document. This requirement is not satisfied by the teachings found in Sethuram et al. It is sufficient for an applicant to cite only a single difference between that which is taught and that which is found in applicants' claims to provide a basis for the withdrawal of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. In this regard, the Examiner's attention is directed to applicants' claimed step which recites "transferring, from said second data processing system to said adapter, real address information indicating desired target memory location for said message." [Emphasis added herein]. The use of real address information constitutes a significant aspect of the claimed invention. This mechanism permits user buffers in one data processing system to be connected directly to user buffers in a second data processing system. However, the word "real" occurs only once in the entire patent to Sethuram et al. Furthermore, in the context that it does appear it refers to "real time." Accordingly, it is seen that the teachings of Sethuram et al. are utterly devoid of any reference to real addresses or to the utilization of real addresses. Accordingly, it is seen that applicants' claims recite steps which refer to the utilization of real address information. However, the patent to

**IBM Docket No. POU920000126US1**

Sethuram et al. contains no teachings whatsoever with respect to the use, generation or transmission of such information.

In the office action referred to above, the Examiner cites applicants' third claim step (Claim 1) which states in relevant part "transferring...real address information indicating desired target memory locations for said message" and refers to column 4, lines 33-44, to line 57 and to column 5, line 1 from the patent to Sethuram et al. However, inspection of this text from the cited patent clearly indicates that the reference is to virtual registers. As is very well known in the computer arts the term "virtual" is not considered to be the same as the term "real". In point of fact, the two terms, virtual and real, are generally considered to be very much opposite concepts.

In point of fact, the essence of the patent to Sethuram et al. is to provide a mechanism for associating messages with virtual circuits. Furthermore, the subject patent is antithetical to the notion of zero copying as set forth in applicants' specification. In point of fact, in the patent to Sethuram et al. an extra copy of the data is required for an application to obtain the data from their ATM buffer. The subject patent does not provide any mechanism in which a specific ATM transfer has a portion of the data going directly to an application buffer. In contrast, in the present application and claims there is provided a method which associates specified user buffers with adapter resources. These adapter resources are further encapsulated in a tag which is provided from the sending side. Hence, in the present method when a sending node sends a message using a tag, the data is put directly into the user buffer and a separate notification is provided. In the present invention the sending side is therefore provided with a mechanism to choose exactly what buffer the data will go into for each transfer. In contrast, in the patent to Sethuram et al. the sending side only has a mechanism for specifying a virtual circuit which is associated with a network buffer rather than a user buffer. Accordingly, it is seen that the subject claims clearly recite processes, methods and claim elements which are different than that which is taught by Sethuram et al. In point of fact, not only are these methods and claim elements

different, but as pointed out above with respect to the use of the terms virtual and real, the subject methods are not only different but inapposite. In short, those of ordinary skill in the art relying upon the teachings of Sethuram et al. would be limited to the utilization of virtual information as opposed to real information for message transmission and would be further limited to virtual circuits.

Accordingly, from the above it is seen that the rejection of applicants' Claims 1-2 can not be sustained. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Additionally, it is noted that applicants' have added two claims herein which more particularly point out and describe some of the features of applicants' invention. In particular, Claim 3 is similar to Claim 1 except that it includes an additional step of establishing an association. Furthermore, Claim 4 has been added to more particularly point out the buffer linkage between the sending side and the receiving side in terms of real address linkage for message transmission.

It is noted that the present response in addition to being as of right, does not require the payment of any additional fees.

Accordingly, it is now seen that all of the applicants' claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, early notification of the allowability of applicants' claims is earnestly solicited. Furthermore, if there are any other matters which the Examiner feels could be expeditiously considered and which would forward the prosecution of the instant application, applicants' attorney wishes to indicate his willingness to engage in any telephonic communication in furtherance of this objective. Accordingly, applicants' attorney may be reached for this purpose at the numbers provided below.

**PATENT**

**IBM Docket No. POU920000126US1**

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Lawrence D. Cutter", written in black ink. The signature is fluid and stylized, with a long horizontal stroke extending from the end of the name.

LAWRENCE D. CUTTER, Sr. Attorney

Reg. No. 28,501

IBM Corporation, IP Law Dept.  
2455 South Rd., M/S P386  
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

Phone: (845) 433-1172  
FAX: (845) 432-9786  
EMAIL: cutter@us.ibm.com